## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

ELAINE WHIGHAM WILLIAMS,	§	
Plaintiff,	§ §	
,	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:19-CV-1587-L
	8	
CITY OF DALLAS POLICE;	§	
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY	§	
PROTECTIVE SERVICES; MEDICAL	§	
CITY HOSPITAL; and MARSH	§	
MCLENNAN COMPANIES,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

## **ORDER**

On August 20, 2019, the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report") (Doc. 7) was entered, recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), with a warning to Plaintiff that she may be sanctioned if she continues to file civil actions based on the same or similar factual allegations in this case. Plaintiff filed objections (Doc. 8) to the Report on September 4, 2019, contesting the magistrate judge's finding of frivolousness.

Having reviewed the pleadings, file, record in this case, and Report, and having conducted a de novo review of that portion of the Report to which objection was made, the court determines that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are correct, **accepts** them as those of the court, and **overrules** Plaintiff's objections (Doc. 8). Accordingly, the court **dismisses with prejudice** as frivolous this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court also warns Plaintiff that future litigation by her that asserts claims based on the same or similar factual allegations in this case—whether filed in this district, another federal district, or state court; or removed or

transferred to this district—may subject her to sanctions, including the imposition of monetary sanctions, and an order precluding her from filing additional documents of any kind without first obtaining leave of court and paying any assessed fine.

The court prospectively **certifies** that any appeal of this action would not be taken in good faith. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). In support of this certification, the court **incorporates** by reference the Report. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 and n.21 (5th Cir. 1997). Based on the Report, the court **concludes** that any appeal of this action would present no legal point of arguable merit and would, therefore, be frivolous. *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983). In the event of an appeal, Plaintiff may challenge this certification by filing a separate motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal with the clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202; Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(5).

It is so ordered this 31st day of October, 2019.

Sam Q. Lindsay

United States District Judge